

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
January 29, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on January 29, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – November 27, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the November 27, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Action Item #C33:</b><br>Status: | Provide the Federal Register Citation for NAGPRA, November 12, 1997.<br>Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager for Cultural Resources reviewed the efforts taken by DWR staff to locate the November 12, 1997 Federal Register Citation. Since no application has been filed related to the Oroville collection under NAGPRA, no citation has appeared in the Federal Register. Until someone files a claim, nothing will be recorded in the Federal Register.   |
| <b>Action Item #C34:</b><br>Status: | Provide an example of a FERC Management Plan table of contents.<br>Steve Heipel, lead for the consulting team brought an example of a FERC Management Plan that was obtained from the State Office on Historic Preservation. However, a private company owns the rights to the plan, and no permission to distribute the Table of Contents had been received as of the meeting date. He did offer to make copies of the Table of Contents available to those who were interested. A sign-up sheet was distributed and those desiring a copy of the sample table of contents added their names. |
| <b>Action Item #C35:</b><br>Status: | Move the Draft Study Plans forward to the Plenary Group.<br>All of the Cultural Resources Draft Study Plans were included in the Study Plan Package distributed to the Plenary Group December 11, 2001. The Facilitator announced that the Plenary Group has been reviewing Critical Path Study Plans.   |

### **Critical Path Study Plan (SP-C1) Review**

The Facilitator explained that at the January 2002 Plenary Group meeting, participants were asked to identify their 'heartburn' issues with those study plans identified as "critical-path. Critical Path refers to those study plans that either need two full years of data collection, have

time-sensitive issues related to data collection, or will produce information needed for other study plans. Twenty-two study plans were identified as critical-path, including the Cultural Resources Study Plan SP-C1. The Plenary Group participants identified 'heartburn' issues with twelve of the twenty-two study plans and referred them back to the appropriate Work Groups for resolution. The remaining Critical Path Study Plans that had no heartburn issues identified were placed on a consent calendar for approval at the February Plenary Group meeting. Once the Work Groups have resolved the issues identified, revised Study Plans will be provided to the Plenary Group participants and reviewed at the February Plenary Group meeting for inclusion on the consent calendar for approval. Janis Offermann from the DWR explained that there were no "heartburn issues" with SP-C1 so it was placed on the consent calendar for the February Plenary Group meeting that will be on February 25, 2002.

One participant asked if any of the cultural study plans would involve the use of models. The Facilitator explained that a Task Force was formed at the Plenary Group meeting focusing on developing a protocol to ensure transparency, credibility, and confidence in all of the models used during the Oroville Facilities relicensing. Mark Basgall with the consulting team suggested that models contemplated for use in the cultural studies would most likely be limited to defining sensitive vs. non-sensitive areas.

#### **Fluctuation Zone Task Force Update**

Michael Delacorte with the consulting team explained that surveys within the fluctuation zone should start by spring. He added that no date had been set to train field personnel but he expected that would probably happen in the next month, following a round of training for the Tribal Legacy Coordinators.

One participant asked how the areas to be surveyed would be chosen. Janis Offermann responded that FERC required 100% of the fluctuation zone to be covered. Michael Delacorte added that there are approximately 7,800 acres within the fluctuation zone. Art Angle commented that there is a lot of land above the high-water level and asked if some of that would be surveyed this spring. Michael said yes, and once surveying begins the teams would work hard to complete as much as possible before weather sets in and makes it difficult to continue.

Craig Jones asked what kind of areas would be targeted above the high-water mark. Michael Delacorte responded that the entire Area of Potential Effect would not be subject to a 100% survey, but that the details had not been decided. He further explained that areas in proximity to recreation areas would be targeted for special consideration and there would likely be a prehistoric sampling design and a historic sampling design.

One participant asked how recreation was being defined and if areas other than 'official' recreation areas would be investigated. Michael Delacorte responded that the team had not yet identified specifically where their survey areas would be located while Steve Heipel added that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group is doing Recreation Access Studies that will provide information about recreation uses at all sites around the Oroville Project facilities to the Cultural Resource Studies. One participant asked if anyone was looking at recreation use in the Project area and Steve Heipel responded that there are 19 Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plans, and each will provide some information useful to the CRWG.

Art Angle asked how long it would be before the Cultural Resources Work Group is notified of high use areas and the potential for development of additional facilities. The Facilitator explained that high-use areas would be known by the end of the first year. The second year would be used to decide where appropriate areas exist for additional facilities. Appropriate

areas will need to meet a number of criteria including low impact on environmental resources as well as consideration of any cultural resource sensitivities.

Art Angle asked about the Interim Projects. The Facilitator explained that DWR had made a presentation at the January Plenary Group meeting regarding their decision on which projects to move forward from the submitted list of Interim Recreation Projects developed through the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group and Plenary Group. While the presentation was not available, Nan Nalder who attended the Plenary Group meeting briefly read the categories of Interim Recreation Projects from her notes.

### **Maidu Advisory Council Update**

Art Angle presented an update of the Maidu Advisory Council activities. He explained that the Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA) had been developed in Maidu Advisory Council meetings, and that tribal approval will be sought at a later date. He also explained how the Maidu Advisory Council was formed and how each tribe is represented by two members.

One participant asked if a list of Federal agencies coordinating with the Maidu Advisory Council could be distributed. Patty Reese-Allen said a letter introducing the Maidu Advisory Council and explaining what it is all about would be distributed soon.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

The Facilitator handed out a schedule of tentative dates for upcoming Cultural Resources Work Group meetings. The participants questioned why the Cultural Resources Work Group meetings had been changed from their agreed-upon Tuesdays. The Facilitator responded that the individuals that put the proposed schedule together had tried to group the meetings so that FERC could attend several with one trip to the west coast but she would inform them that the Cultural Resources Work Group needed their meetings to be on Tuesdays and revise the schedule accordingly. Steve Heipel suggested that since they have completed their study plans, the Cultural Resources Work Group could skip a February meeting. He suggested a summary update be distributed instead which would update the group on Maidu Advisory Council activities, Fluctuation Zone training, etc. The group concurred and agreed not to hold a February Work Group meeting as long as a summary was distributed. The Cultural Resources Work Group agreed to meet next on a Tuesday in March:

Date: March 25, 2002 (potential date to change)  
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group included a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

**Action Item #C36:** Provide Interim Recreation Project presentation to Cultural Work Group.  
**Responsible:** DWR Staff  
**Due Date:** March meeting

**Action Item #C37:** Distribute a summary update in lieu of February Cultural Resources Work Group meeting.  
**Responsible:** Consulting Team  
**Due Date:** March 1, 2002

**Action Item #C38:** Distribute Table of Contents for sample Management Plan

**Responsible:** Steve Heipel  
**Due Date:** March 1, 2002

**Action Item #C39:** Revise schedule to ensure Cultural Resources Work Group meetings are held on Tuesdays only

**Responsible:** Facilitator  
**Due Date:** March 1, 2002